

Weekly Compilation of  
**Presidential  
Documents**



Monday, July 10, 1995  
Volume 31—Number 27  
Pages 1181–1208

## Contents

### Addresses and Remarks

Connecticut, Special Olympics in New Haven—1187  
Georgetown University—1190  
Illinois, American Association of Physicians from India in Chicago—1181  
National Education Association—1200  
Radio address—1186  
Space Shuttle *Atlantis* astronauts, telephone conversation—1206

### Appointments and Nominations

White House Office  
Deputy Staff Secretary—1186  
Staff Secretary—1186

### Communications to Congress

Bulgaria, letter transmitting report—1189  
“Ryan White CARE Act,” letter—1188

### Statements by the President

*See also* Appointments and Nominations  
National economy—1207

### Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—1208  
Checklist of White House press releases—1208  
Digest of other White House announcements—1207  
Nominations submitted to the Senate—1207

## WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

## PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

Published every Monday by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* contains statements, messages, and other Presidential materials released by the White House during the preceding week.

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under

regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* will be furnished by mail to domestic subscribers for \$80.00 per year (\$137.00 for mailing first class) and to foreign subscribers for \$93.75 per year, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The charge for a single copy is \$3.00 (\$3.75 for foreign mailing).

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*.

Week Ending Friday, July 7, 1995

**Remarks to the American Association  
of Physicians From India in Chicago,  
Illinois**

*June 30, 1995*

Thank you so much, Dr. Khedkar. Thank you, Dr. Ahuja. And thank you, Dr. Lalmalani, for that terrific speech. I was just sitting here watching you speak with such energy and enthusiasm. And I was thinking to myself, I hope he stays in medicine and out of politics until I'm through. *[Laughter]* Dr. Rupani, thank you for welcoming us to Illinois. To my good friend, B.K. Agnihotri, it's good to see you, and out of the South, where we normally see each other. We're delighted here with the presence of the Indian Health Minister, Minister Antulay. Thank you very much for coming from such a long way. And I am especially delighted to see the Indian Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Ambassador Ray. Thank you so much. Thank you. We're delighted to see you.

As I think all of you know. I have been very interested in education and in health care for a long time. But I must say I was certainly humbled when young Dr. Ambotti was introduced at 17 years old. Then it was whispered in my ear that his brother became a doctor at the ripe old age of 19. *[Laughter]* Is that right? There he is. He was so old he hardly had any years left to practice at 19. *[Laughter]*

That's remarkable. You know, when I was elected Governor at 32, they said I was too young. *[Laughter]* When I was a college professor at 26, they said I was too young. When I was elected the third youngest President at the age of 46, they said I was too young. Where were you guys when I needed you? *[Laughter]* Well, your families and your friends and, indeed, all of us should be very, very proud. And congratulations to you, to both of you.

I know that Hillary would want me also to say, since I am the one doing the speaking

today, that she and our daughter Chelsea had a magnificent time on their trip to India and, indeed, throughout South Asia. As I said to your board of directors a few moments ago, they came home laden with photographs, with films, with books, with all kinds of gifts. You could go to some places in the White House and some corners, and all of you would think you were back home. You would not even recognize—*[laughter]*—that you were in the President's residence.

But it was a remarkable experience for her, a transforming experience for our daughter, and a great learning experience for me by extension. I can also say I am very, very proud of the strengthening relationships between the United States and India since I have been President. We have been fortunate, thanks to the end of the cold war, to be able to bind these two great democracies more closely together, to support the economic reform efforts in India, to support a closer political relationship, to look toward a 21st century in which together we can advocate freedom for all the peoples of the world, and all the peoples of Asia in particular.

I also want to say I am deeply indebted to the Asian-Indian Americans who are serving in our administration. I cannot name them all, but I would like to mention Arati Prabhakar, who is the Director of the National Institute of Science and Technology, something important to all of you; Dave Sharma, who heads the Research and Special Programs Administration at the Department of Transportation, both of them have done a fine job; Dr. Sam Shekar, a member of AAPI, who's the Director of the Health Care Financing Administration's Practicing Physicians Advisory Council—we need more advice from practicing physicians and less from bureaucrats—and Niranjana Shah, who is here, is on the Goldwater Scholarship Foundation. There are others, but I want to thank all of you who have contributed to this administration.

I want to thank the AAPI for many things, for all the work you do, which your leader has already outlined, the work you have done in our country, the work you have done in India. But most recently, I am indebted to your association for your support of the nomination of Dr. Foster to be the Surgeon General. I thank you for that very much.

I think many of you could identify with him in many ways but perhaps most important that he was a man who had spent almost 40 years doing what other people talk about doing. He had brought health care to people who would not have had it otherwise. He had delivered thousands of babies. He had trained hundreds of doctors. He had actually looked many troubled young people in the eye and told them that they should stay off drugs, they should stay in school, they should not have sex, they should be against teen pregnancy, they should start a better life for themselves.

He had actually done these things. And a lot of people who condemned him, I think, missed a terrific opportunity to give a real practicing physician a chance to change the lives of more young people in America. You saw that. You stood by him. And I will never ever forget it. I thank you very much.

I also want to thank you for something else, something more profound that you do every day, many of you without even knowing it. I ran for President for two reasons. One, I thought our country was drifting and not facing the challenges of the moment and that we were at risk of raising the first generation of Americans to do worse than their parents, when it was not necessary. So I wanted to restore the American dream of economy and prosperity for those who work hard.

Second, I thought our country was on the edge of either becoming the greatest country in the world for the 21st century again or being divided in ways that will weaken us. The enormous racial and religious and ethnic diversity of America is the meal ticket of the United States to the future if we can come together, instead of permitting ourselves to be divided by those who seek short-term political advantage from the differences among us. And I want this country to pull together. And I want you to lead the way.

It is obvious that both these objectives become imperative when you consider the realities of the world we face. We are no longer divided by the cold war. The geopolitical realities of India from time to time forced you and the United States to make decisions which divided our two great democracies because of the cold war, even though we were both democracies. The end of the cold war means that we don't have to divide the world up in that way anymore. The dawn of the information age and the technological revolution means that people can move ideas and technology and funds around the world in a split second, that all of us can move more rapidly than ever before.

Therefore, this is a time of enormous human potential. But it is also full of challenges. It is full of economic challenges, because the global economy means that if America wants to continue not only to be a wealthy country but to have everybody able to work hard and be rewarded, that all those people that live within our borders now must compete with people beyond our borders. It means education is more important than ever before. It means personal productivity is more important than ever before. It means the strength of a family's work habits are more important than ever before if we want to lift all Americans up, because now we are not isolated behind our own borders.

That is why so many Americans are frustrated today. They see our economy growing, unemployment is down, 6.7 million new jobs. But still more than half of our working people are working longer work weeks without getting a raise, under the pressure of the global economy. So that is the irony of America. We have more new businesses in the last 2 years than at any time in our history. We have more new millionaires in the last 2 years than at any time in our history, and most people stuck in a rut. So our challenge is to keep all these good things going and lift the rest of Americans who are in the rut out of it.

The same thing is true—[applause]—thank you. The same thing is true about making the most of our diversity. The cold war is over. That means we don't have to worry about nuclear annihilation. For the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there are

no Russian missiles pointed at Americans, no American missiles pointed at Russians. Our space ships linked up yesterday; many of you must have seen it on television. How exciting it was. But when you take the heavy hand of authoritarianism away, you see the horrible conflict in Bosnia, where centuries old religious animosities flare up again today once there is no Yugoslavia run by a Tito to control people. Even in Russia, as it becomes more democratic, you see the ethnic fighting in a place like Chechnya consuming the energies of the nation and threatening the values of the nation.

And in our country, with no iron hand of fear of something outside us to keep us together, you see now resurgent religious and ethnic differences manifesting themselves even across the United States. This is folly. We must find a way to live together, sharing the values of the American Constitution, respecting our different religious heritages, our different ethnic heritages, our different racial heritages. We have counties in the United States now with more than 100 different ethnic groups. Los Angeles County now has 150 different. And I say good; this is good for America. This is a good thing if we can use it to come together. It means we can trade with every country in the world. It means some of us can speak to people in every place in the world.

What other nation could have done what we did in Haiti, liberating them from the long night of dictatorship, and doing it by putting 200 Americans in military uniform on the ground in Haiti to speak Creole because they were Haitian-Americans? That's the great thing about this country.

We are a land and we are a set of ideas and convictions. We are not a single ethnic group. That is the magic of our democracy. We are a land and we are a single set of convictions, rooted in the simple but powerful words of our Constitution and its Bill of Rights, and our devotion to freedom and to competition and to openness. That is our meal ticket to the future. That is what will make it possible for us, not only to succeed economically but to live in harmony, if we can be faithful to it. And that has been the purpose of my Presidency.

Now, what I want to say to you today is to echo a few words that your leader just spoke. We are having a great debate in the United States today, largely because we are at the end of the cold war, largely because we are in a new economic time, largely because all these changes have forced Americans both to change the way they live and work and to try to think of how we should organize ourselves into the future.

And there are many people in the Nation's Capital who believe something that I think a lot of you do not believe. And that's one of the reasons I'm here. They say—and many of them who disagree with me would use you as an example, a good example—they would say all of the problems in America today are personal problems, individual failures; they are cultural problems. Why, if everybody would just wake up tomorrow and work hard and have a good family, we wouldn't have any other problems. And they would say if they were here arguing, they would say, look at all those Indian doctors and their families, who come to our country: many people come to our country without any money at all, and they become very successful. Why? Because they work like crazy and they have good family values and they transmit them to their children. And I agree with that. I mean, I agree with that. By definition—you know, no one can become anything just because someone else gives them something. We all have to work and build ourselves inside. That is true; at one level that is true.

But then they take another step. And that is the debate in Washington with which I do not agree. The next step is if all of our problems are personal and cultural and can be solved by people working harder and having stronger families, we, therefore, have no problems that are economic, political, and social. And therefore, there is nothing for us to do together. No public response required. No governmental action required. Now, that is what I don't agree with.

Our country became the strongest in the world after World War II and grew the biggest middle class in the world after World War II because we recognized that our challenge was both personal and public. And when the soldiers came home after the Second World War and built the America that

many of you wished to come to, they did it because the Congress passed something called the GI bill of rights, which enabled them to go to school, to buy a home for the first time, that gave us over two-thirds of our people owning their own home, something unheard of in virtually any country in the world, because there was public action. So we had personal responsibility and public action.

When you go out and practice medicine to people who don't have any way to see a doctor, unless you see them and you get paid because of Medicare or Medicaid, that's personal responsibility by you and public action by your country. And so what I say to you is that this debate, which I, too, want you to be a part of, about the future of health care, is one facet of this huge debate we're having in America today about how we're going to organize ourselves for the future.

And I believe America should come down firmly on the side of saying, yes, we have to have more personal responsibility and family strength, but we also need to face our problems together, because we cannot solve the education problem unless we solve it together. We cannot solve the crime problem unless we're all willing to make some sacrifices to solve it together. We certainly cannot solve the health care problem if we let every individual in America go his or her own way. We're going to have a lot of older people and a lot of innocent children in dire straits in America. We need to do some things together. That is the way we're going to succeed in the 21st century, by working together.

On health care alone, let me just make a few observations. We have a big problem in America with our budget deficit. You all know that. What I want you to know is just how big a problem it is and where it's located. Our budget would be in balance today but for the interest we pay on the debt we ran up in the 12 years before I became President. It would be in balance today. Not only that, it's still such a big problem that next year the interest we pay on that debt will be larger than our defense budget.

We have not increased anything much in our budget in the last few years except Medicare and Medicaid had been growing at two

and three times, sometimes more than three times, the rate of inflation. Part of that is because more people have been going onto the program. Part of that is because as older people live longer and longer and longer, they have to access medical services more and more, as many of you know.

But the truth is, if we are going to have money in the United States Treasury to invest in education, to invest in technology, to invest in medical research, something you all believe in, we are going to have to reduce this——

*[At this point, the sound system malfunctioned.]*

Did it come on? Is it on? What about now? Can you hear me in the back?

**Audience members.** Yes!

**The President.** Someone said, no, and I'm sure glad. *[Laughter]* Well, anyway, I'll talk louder, and we'll do the best we can. Something happened to it. I didn't touch it. It just happened. *[Laughter]* Eventually they'll get it back.

If we're going to do this, we're going to have to bring that deficit down, which means as Dr. Lalimalani said, we're going to have to change the way we do health care. But there is a huge difference in making a deliberate change over a reasonable period of time and just cutting the budget out of Medicare and Medicaid to meet an arbitrary date to balance the budget for an arbitrary huge tax cut to a lot of folks who don't need that as much as they need a country with good health care, strong education, safe streets, and a balanced budget.

What I want to say to you is, yes, we will have to slow the growth of Medicare and Medicaid, but we should do it in a fair way. If you balance the budget in 10 years instead of 7, if you have a much smaller tax cut and you target it to the things we already said we believed in, child rearing and education, if we involve the physicians and other health care professionals in our country in making the decisions instead of just making arbitrary cuts in these medical costs, we can get where we need to go as a country and still provide decent health care and still provide a good quality of life and not divide our people even

further by income and by region and by race. Now, that's what we can do.

A lot of you know this because of your own practice, but if we cut too much without understanding the circumstances, we will isolate more elderly people, we will isolate more racial minorities, we will disadvantage more young children who will suffer intellectually because of the health care they don't have when they're very young. So this is a very important part of rebuilding America.

*[The sound system produced a loud feedback sound.]*

Better none at all than that. *[Laughter]*

So I say to you, in the next 4 or 5 months, we will chart a major part of America's health care course for the future. And my commitment to you is, I will work with you. I do not want to see these decisions made without working with you. *[Applause]* Thank you.

But keep in mind, the health care debate is an example of the larger debate I talked to you about. And you can have a huge impact on Members of Congress in both parties if you simply show up and say, "Look, I know America first and foremost is a place where individual effort and family values count. That's why I am successful. But I live in the real America, not in Washington, DC. And I know we need a public response to society's problems if more people are going to become like me." That's what I want you to say to the Congress. And you can do that.

And then I want you to be involved. And I want you to say, don't wait until the day before you pass this budget to point out what the changes will be in Medicare and Medicaid. Let's say it well in advance. Don't wait until one day or two days or even a week before and then jam it through. Let's say right now, if we're going to cut Medicare and Medicaid projected expenditures by the amount you say, what changes will be made in Medicare and Medicaid. Then let us tell you—I don't want anybody to get hysterical or angry or anything—let us tell you what the consequences of those changes will be. And then let's work together to do something

that is good for America. We should do what is right here.

And it is not necessary—I will say again—it is not necessary to dramatically undermine Medicare and Medicaid. It is not necessary to hurt defenseless children or elderly people who don't have enough to live on as it is to balance the budget. We do not have to do that. It is certainly not necessary to undermine the medical practice. It is not—also, it is not necessary to undermine the integrity of the doctor-patient relationship. It is not necessary.

And I certainly agree with you. I think—I am all for managed care plans if people voluntarily join them and if every physician who is willing to meet the requirements of the plan has a chance to practice to maintain choice for consumers.

So I want to make this point again. This budget debate, because it's part of a larger social debate, can empower all of you as citizens far beyond voting, contributing to candidates, being active in political campaigns. This budget debate can empower you because every one of you can be heard by your Member of Congress. And you can say, "I accept what you're saying that our problems require harder work, more discipline, stronger families. But it is not enough. It also requires us to work together. And I want to be heard in the health care debate. And I want you to enable America to balance the budget and meet its responsibilities to bring us together and move us forward." If you'll do that, I'll be grateful.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:35 p.m. in the Sheraton Chicago. In his remarks, he referred to Dr. Nanda Khedkar and Dr. Satya Ahuja, convention cochairmen; Dr. Gopal Lalmalani, national president; Dr. Prem Rupani, president, India Medical Association of Illinois; B.K. Agnihotri, chancellor, Southern University Law Center, Baton Rouge, LA; Indian Minister of Health and Family Welfare A.R. Antulay; and S.S. Ray, Indian Ambassador to the U.S. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

**Appointment of Todd Stern as White House Staff Secretary and Philip Caplan as White House Deputy Staff Secretary**

*June 30, 1995*

The President today named White House Deputy Staff Secretary Todd Stern to be Assistant to the President and Staff Secretary.

Mr. Stern will be replaced as Deputy Staff Secretary by Special Assistant to the President Philip Caplan, of the White House Cabinet Affairs office.

"Todd Stern has done an outstanding job managing my substantial information flow and providing important counsel. I am confident he will continue to serve with distinction as Staff Secretary. Both Todd and Phil Caplan are valued members of this administration, and I expect they will continue to make important contributions in their new roles," the President said.

NOTE: Biographies of the appointees were made available by the Office of the Press Secretary. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

**The President's Radio Address**

*July 1, 1995*

Good morning. On this Fourth of July weekend, I want to talk about one thing that is at the root of all of our independence: going to work. It makes you self-sufficient. It makes you and your family truly independent.

Unfortunately, millions of Americans are not independent because they are dependent on welfare. The vast majority of these Americans dream the same dreams most of us do. They want the same dignity that comes from going to work and the pride that comes from doing right by their children. They want to be independent.

The Congress and I are now working hard on welfare reform to give them that kind of independence. I look forward to Congress passing and my signing into law a bipartisan bill that stands a real chance of ending welfare as we know it.

Though there are very different approaches in the bills now before Congress,

we have agreed on much of what we need to do. We agree there must be time limits on welfare after which all who can, must work. And I'm pleased that Congress has now agreed with me that we must enforce child support with the toughest possible laws.

But if we're going to end welfare, we must do more about a crucial element that is missing from the current approach of many in Congress. Instead of providing the child care people need to get off welfare, some in Congress actually are trying to cut child care.

So today I say to Congress, child care must be the central element of our effort to put welfare mothers to work. The bold plan that I support, which has been proposed by Senators Daschle, Breaux, and Mikulski, provides that kind of child care. Our bill presents a genuine opportunity for bipartisan agreement, and I hope we take advantage of it soon. After all, we should want the same thing for people on welfare we want for all Americans, the chance to build strong families and to make the most of their own lives.

The very name of the welfare program says it all: Aid to Families With Dependent Children. Children by nature are dependent. The point of welfare reform must not be to punish children but to help their families become independent. To be independent with dependent children, a person must be able to succeed both as a worker and a parent. That's what most Americans have to do these days. That's a big reason I worked so hard back in 1993 to cut taxes for working families with children whose incomes were under \$28,000, and now they're about \$1,000 lower than they used to be.

And that's why I'm working hard to include in my middle class bill of rights a tax credit of \$500 per child for all the children under 13 in middle class families. And that's why it is pure fantasy to believe we can put a welfare mother to work unless we provide child care for her children. We don't need more latchkey kids. We certainly don't need more neglected children. And we don't want more welfare mothers staying at home, living on welfare, just because they can't find child care.

We do want people to be good workers and good parents. And if we want parents on welfare to go to work, we have to make



sure they can find good, clean, safe places for their children to go during the day.

Many in Congress want to cut child care just to save money. Well, I want to cut spending, and I want to save money too. But we have to do it the smart way. Cutting child care will make it harder for parents to get off and stay off welfare. It will, therefore, cost us far more down the road than it will ever save in the near term.

Some people in Congress want to take even more extreme steps that will hurt, not strengthen, families. They don't want welfare reform unless it cuts off all help to children whose mothers are poor, young, and unmarried. I want to discourage teen pregnancy. We have to do that, but not by hurting innocent babies. We should require teen mothers to live at home, stay in school, and turn their lives around so they and their children stay off welfare for good.

Our administration has already put 29 States on the road to ending welfare as we know it with waivers to free them up from cumbersome Federal rules and regulations when they have good ideas to reform welfare.

Today I'm pleased to announce that Virginia will receive the newest waiver. Virginia's plan requires people on welfare to go to work. Like the States of Oregon, Missouri, and a few others, it also allows money now spent on welfare and food stamps to go to employers to supplement wages to help create jobs in the private sector. And it helps people get child care. It's a good plan, and I'm proud to be supporting it.

Several months ago, I called on Congress to send me a welfare reform bill by July the 4th, Independence Day. I'm disappointed they haven't been able to meet that deadline, but I am hopeful that we'll move forward on a bipartisan welfare reform bill. I don't want filibusters. I don't want vetoes. I don't want gridlock. But I do want real welfare reform that requires work, demands responsibility, and provides the child care people need to move off welfare and to be successful as workers and parents.

It's time to get to work so we can give millions of other Americans a new Independence Day.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 12:38 p.m. on June 30 at the Sheraton Chicago in Chicago, IL, for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on July 1.

### **Remarks at the Opening Ceremonies of the Special Olympics in New Haven, Connecticut**

*July 1, 1995*

Let's give her another hand. [*Applause*] Thank you, Loretta Claiborne, for that wonderful introduction. And thank you for the power of your example for young people all across America and throughout the world: I know we're all impressed that you have completed 25 marathons. I'm also pleased that in these games you're representing Team Pennsylvania in one of my favorite sports, bowling. I also want to thank four other very special runners—four members of the United States Special Olympics Team, David Congdon, David McQuarry, Troy Rutter and Daniel Bailey, who came to Washington to the White House this week to run 3 miles with me to highlight the importance of Special Olympics. They were much faster than I was, but they were very gentle and kind that day. I want to congratulate the city of New Haven and the State of Connecticut for the magnificent job that they have done. From the Governor, the Senators, the members of the congressional district, to the mayor, to all the ordinary citizens in this State and this wonderful city where my wife and I met almost 25 years ago: You have done a wonderful, wonderful job.

Ladies and gentlemen, we must also thank the person whose inspiration, leadership, and determination has brought us all here today, the founder of these games, Eunice Shriver. Year after year, decade after decade, her vision grows clearer and her energy seems to increase as she brings more and more and more of us throughout the world into the orbit of her incredible determination to make the Special Olympics all that it can be and to mean all that it can mean for all of us.

We also thank her for making the Special Olympics a family affair. Thank you, Sargent Shriver, for being the creative force behind the worldwide growth of Special Olympics. And thank you, Timothy Shriver, for doing

such an outstanding job as president of these 1995 games.

I also want to thank the distinguished former Governor of Connecticut, Lowell Weicker, who has continued to serve his country magnificently as the chairman of these 1995 games. Thank you, Lowell Weicker. Please stand up. Thank you. [*Applause*]

Let me welcome also leaders throughout the world who have come here to cheer for their athletes. We have people from countries all across the globe. I am here to cheer for the Americans. They're here to cheer for their athletes. And we're all here to cheer all of you on. Thank you for coming from all distant corners of the globe.

These world games are being called the games of inclusion. From their beginnings in the United States 27 years ago, the Special Olympics have grown to include more than 144 countries on 6 continents. Large and small nations are represented here, welcomed as equals.

We have seen here people brought together of every race, color, and creed, every faith, in a joyful celebration of peaceful competition, good will, and the triumph of the human spirit. The world could learn a great lesson from all of you standing down here in the Yale Bowl tonight: Everybody counts, and everybody can do something very, very important and good.

You are the living symbol that we can reach across continents, across cultures, across human differences, to unleash the God-given potential that lies within every individual. You have shown us in so many ways that when you are given the chance, you can do extraordinary things. The world community is recognizing this more and more.

We have come so far in such a short time. Here in the United States, it has only been 5 years since we passed the Americans With Disabilities Act, committing ourselves to treating our people on the basis of their abilities, not their disabilities.

And the world is moving as well. This week, on its 50th anniversary, the United Nations convened the very first international symposium on intellectual disabilities. There is more to come.

But our work is not yet done. President Kennedy once said that the rights of every man are diminished when the rights of one man are threatened. So tonight, I challenge all of you and every citizen of the world watching us to be an olympic champion for inclusion, a champion for equal rights, a champion for dignity, a champion for the triumph of the human spirit in all of us.

That spirit, that spirit, these athletes are about to show all over the globe. So, by all means and with great spirit, let the games begin.

I want all of you to know that you have our love, our support, and our admiration. I hereby declare the 1995 Special Olympics World Games officially open.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:40 p.m. at the Yale Bowl. In his remarks, he referred to Loretta Claiborne, athlete and Special Olympics board member; Gov. John G. Rowland of Connecticut; and Mayor John DeStefano of New Haven, CT.

### **Letter to Congressional Leaders on the "Ryan White CARE Act"**

*July 5, 1995*

*Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. Leader:)*

I am writing to urge you to lead the Congress in passing the reauthorization of the Ryan White CARE Act before the summer recess. We cannot allow this crucial program to lapse.

There is strong bipartisan support for the Ryan White CARE Act. The initial legislation was approved by overwhelming margins in both houses (95-4 in the Senate and 408-14 in the House) and signed into law by President Bush. Funding for this program has been endorsed from both sides of the aisle throughout the five years of the program and the reauthorization bill in the Senate has 60 co-sponsors. It is a program vital to the lives of Americans living with HIV and AIDS. Its existence has had a dramatic impact on the quality and length of their lives while helping to reduce the cost of their care.

The CARE Act provides direct services to people living with HIV and AIDS through grants to states, cities, community organizations, and local clinics. It emphasizes outpatient care in clinics and other facilities and

is designed to relieve the burden on public hospitals and other more expensive inpatient facilities.

It has been a tremendous success in meeting this mandate. By lessening the demand on public hospitals and other facilities, valuable inpatient resources have been freed to care for patients with other diseases, and people with HIV and AIDS have been able to lead more productive lives in their communities. The CARE Act approach serves as a model for delivering more cost-effective health care for people with all diseases.

In 1994, the CARE Act provided care to more than 200,000 uninsured and underinsured people living with HIV or AIDS and early intervention services to another 85,000 people. The Act also funded HIV counseling and testing to nearly 100,000 Americans, provided pharmaceutical assistance to 75,000 individuals, and supported more than 15,000 women and children participating in AIDS-related clinical trials.

Let me share with you the story of one person who has been helped by this program—one person whose experience with the CARE Act is typical of literally hundreds of thousands of other Americans who have benefited from this law. “Debbie” is a 27 year old woman living with AIDS in a rural part of South Carolina. Until recently, few doctors in Debbie’s hometown were willing to treat AIDS patients in part because so many were uninsured. With funding from the Ryan White CARE Act, the County Health Department opened a clinic in the town of Orangeburg that operated six days a month with a rotating staff of five physicians and three nurses. The clinic’s staff has taught Debbie’s mother to care for her daughter at home. When Debbie is too sick to come to the clinic, the staff comes to her. Not only has this prevented more costly hospitalizations, but it provides Debbie and her mother peace of mind. Debbie’s Mom calls the clinic’s staff her “guardian angels.”

The Ryan White CARE Act is a model of compassionate caring for people in need. At a time when AIDS is the leading cause of death of young adults, we cannot let reauthorization of the CARE Act be held up by divisive arguments about how people contracted HIV. Nor should we be deterred by

the false argument that people with HIV and AIDS are getting more help than those with other diseases. In fact, total federal spending in FY 1995 for research, treatment prevention, Medicaid, Medicare, and income supplements for AIDS is less than one-third that for cancer and less than one-sixth that for heart disease. (AIDS spending is \$6 billion, cancer is \$17.5 billion, and heart disease is \$38 billion.)

In the United States, an average of 220 Americans are being diagnosed with AIDS every day and an average of 109 Americans are dying of this disease each day. Now is not the time to retreat in our national response to this terrible disease. We must move forward to meet the very real needs of Americans living with HIV and AIDS. We can certainly do more, we cannot do any less.

I hope you will join me in urging the Congress to move forward promptly with a five-year reauthorization of this vital program without complicated amendments so that we can once again show the American people that their government can provide the assistance they deserve.

Sincerely,

**Bill Clinton**

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Bob Dole, Senate majority leader.

### **Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on Most- Favored-Nation Trade Status for Bulgaria**

*July 5, 1995*

*Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. President:)*

On June 3, 1993, I determined and reported to the Congress that Bulgaria is in full compliance with the freedom of emigration criteria of sections 402 and 409 of the Trade Act of 1974. This action allowed for the continuation of most-favored-nation (MFN) status for Bulgaria and certain other activities without the requirement of a waiver.

As required by law, I am submitting an updated report to the Congress concerning emigration laws and policies of the Republic

of Bulgaria. You will find that the report indicates continued Bulgarian compliance with U.S. and international standards in the area of emigration policy.

Sincerely,

**William J. Clinton**

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Albert Gore, Jr., President of the Senate.

### **Remarks at Georgetown University**

*July 6, 1995*

Thank you very much, my good friend, Father O'Donovan. You just gave the speech in 5 minutes; there's nothing for me to say. [*Laughter*] I thank you for welcoming me back. I thank the members of our administration who are here: Secretary Riley and Deputy Secretary Kunin, Ambassador Raser, Director of the USIA Joe Duffy, Chairman Sheldon Hackney and Jane Alexander; and Penn Kemble, the Deputy Director of the USIA. And I thank my former classmates, some of whom I see out here, and my friends and people around this country who have done so much to try to strengthen the bonds of American citizenship.

Today I want to have more of a conversation than deliver a formal speech, about the great debate now raging in our Nation, not so much over what we should do but over how we should resolve the great questions of our time, here in Washington and in communities all across our country. I want to talk about the obligations of citizenship, the obligations imposed on the President and people in power, and the obligations imposed on all Americans.

Two days ago we celebrated the 219th birthday of our democracy. The Declaration of Independence was also clearly a declaration of citizenship, all men are created equal, endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. It was also manifestly a declaration of citizenship in a different way; it was a declaration of interdependence. For the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

The distinguished American historian, Samuel Eliot Morison, in his "History of the American People," wrote of these words, "These words are more revolutionary than anything written by Robespierre, Marx, or Lenin, more explosive than the atom, a continual challenge to ourselves as well as an inspiration to the oppressed of all the world."

What is the challenge to ourselves at the dawn of the 21st century and how shall we meet it? First of all, we must remember that the Declaration of Independence was written as a commitment for all Americans at all times, not just in time of war or great national crisis.

My argument to you is pretty straightforward. I believe we face challenges of truly historic dimensions, challenges here at home perhaps greater than any we faced since the beginning of this century we are about to finish and the dawn of the industrial era. But they are not greater challenges in their own way than the ones we faced at our birth, greater challenges than those of slavery and civil war, greater than those of World War I or the depression or World War II. And they can be solved, though they are profound. What are they?

Most people my age grew up in an America dominated by middle class dreams and middle class values: the life we wanted to live and the kind of people we wanted to be; dreams that inspired those who were born into the middle class; dreams that restrained and directed the lives of those who were much more successful and more powerful; dreams that animated the strivings of those who were poor because of the condition of their birth or because they came here as immigrants; middle class dreams that there would be reward for work and that the future of our children would be better than the lives we enjoyed. Middle class values, strong families and faith, safe streets, secure futures: These things are very much threatened today, threatened by 20 years of stagnant incomes, of harder work by good Americans for the same or lower pay, of increasing inequity of incomes, and increasing insecurity in jobs and retirement and health care.

They are threatened by 30 years of social problems of profound implications—family break-ups, of a rising tide of violence and

drugs, of declining birth rates among successful married couples, and rising birth rates among young people who are not married. They are threatened by the failure of public institutions to respond; the failure of bureaucracies encrusted in yesterday's prerogatives and not meeting the challenges of today and tomorrow—the schools, the law enforcement agencies, the governments and their economic and other policies. They are threatened by the sheer pace and scope of change as technology and ideas and money and decisions move across the globe at breathtaking rates, and every great opportunity seems to carry within it the seeds of a great problem.

So that we have anomalies everywhere: Abroad, the cold war ends, but we see the rise and the threat of technology-based destruction, sarin gas exploding in the subway in Japan, the bomb exploding in Oklahoma City. The Soviet Union is no more, and so they worry now in the Baltics about becoming a conduit for drug trafficking, and they worry in Russia about their banks being taken over by organized crime. And here at home, it all seems so confusing—the highest growth rates in a decade, the stock market at an all-time high, almost 7 million more jobs, more millionaires and new businesses than ever before, but most people working harder for less, feeling more insecure.

I saw it just the other day, this cartoon, which you probably can't see, but I'll read it to you. There's a politician—maybe it's supposed to be me—[*laughter*—up here giving a speech at a banquet, one of those interminable banquets we all attend. And here's a waiter serving one of the attendees. The politician says, "The current recovery has created over 7.8 million jobs." The waiter says, "And I've got three of them." [*Laughter*]

In 1991, as Father O'Donovan said, I came here to Georgetown to talk about these challenges and laid out my philosophy about how we as a people, not just as a government but as a people, ought to meet them. I called it the New Covenant. I will repeat briefly what I said then because I don't believe I can do any better today than I did then in terms of what I honestly believe we ought to be doing.

I think we have to create more opportunity and demand more responsibility. I think we have to give citizens more say and provide them a more responsive, less bureaucratic Government. I think we have to do these things because we are literally a community, an American family that is going up or down together, whether we like it or not. If we're going to have middle class dreams and middle class values, we have to do things as private citizens, and we have to do things in partnership through our public agencies and through our other associations.

In 1994, when the Republicans won a majority in Congress, they offered a different view which they called their "Contract With America." In their view most of our problems were personal and cultural; the Government tended to make them worse because it was bureaucratic and wedded to the past and more interested in regulating and choking off the free enterprise system and promoting the welfare state; and therefore, what we should do is to balance the budget as soon as possible, cut taxes as much as possible, deregulate business completely if possible, and cut our investments in things like welfare as much as possible.

As you know, I thought there were different things that ought to be done because I believed in partnership. I believed in supporting community initiatives that were working and preventing things before they happened, instead of just punishing bad behavior after it occurred, and trying to empower people to make the most of their own lives. So I believed that there were things we could do here in Washington to help, whether it was family leave, or tougher child support enforcement, or reforming the pension system to save the pensions of over 8 million American workers, or investing more in education, making college more affordable.

What I believe grows largely out of my personal history and a lot of it happened to me a long time before I came to Georgetown and read in books things that made me convinced that I was basically right. I grew up in a small town in a poor State. When I was born at the end of World War II, my State's per capita income was barely half the national average. I was the first person in my

family to go to college. When I was a boy I lived for a while on a farm without an indoor toilet. It makes a good story, not as good as being born in a log cabin, but it's true. [Laughter]

I had a stepfather without a high school diploma and a grandfather, whom I loved above all people almost, who had a sixth-grade education. I lived in a segregated society, and I lived in a family, as has now been well-documented, with problems of alcohol and later, drug abuse. I learned a lot about what I call the New Covenant, about the importance of responsibility and opportunity.

I lived in a family where everybody worked hard and where kids were expected to study hard. But I also had a lot of opportunity that was given to me by my community. I had good teachers and good schools. And when I needed them, I got scholarships and jobs. I saw what happened to good people who had no opportunity because they happened to be black or because they happened to be poor and white and isolated in the hills and hollows of the mountains of my State.

I saw what happened in my own family to people who were good people but didn't behave responsibly. My stepfather was very responsible toward me but not very responsible toward himself. Anybody who's ever lived in a family with an alcoholic knows that there is nothing you can do for somebody else they are not prepared to do for themselves. And my brother, after all of his struggles with drug addiction, which included even serving some time in jail, I am sometimes more proud of him than I am of what I've done because he has a family and a son and a life, not because of the love and support that we all gave him but because of what he did for himself.

So my whole political philosophy is basically rooted in what I think works. It works for families and communities, and it worked pretty well for our country for a long time.

If you look at recent American history, our country has never been perfect because none of us are, but we did always seem to be going in the right direction.

I remember when I was a boy in the fifties and sixties—I remember like it was yesterday when I graduated from high school in 1964, and we had about 3-percent unemployment,

about 3- or 4-percent real growth, and very modest inflation. And we all just assumed that the American dream would work out all right if we could ever whip racism. If we could just whip that and make sure all poor people had a chance to work their way into the middle class, we could just almost put this country on automatic. I know that's hard to believe, but that's basically what we thought back then. If we could just somehow lift this awful racial burden off our shoulders and learn how to live together, we could just roll on.

And then in the sixties and the seventies and the eighties, the results got a lot more mixed. Contrary to what a lot of people say now in retrospect, the sixties were not all bad. A lot of good things happened. A lot of people passionately believed that they had a responsibility to help one another achieve the fullest of their God-given potential. And a lot of the important advances in civil rights and in education and in fighting poverty really made a difference. But it was also a time when many people began to have such profound cultural clashes that more and more people dropped out and became more self-indulgent.

Contrary to popular retrospect, a lot of good things happened in the seventies. We made a national commitment as a country to defend our environment. This is a safer, cleaner, healthier place because of what we've done for the last 25 years. We decided in a bipartisan way that the workplace ought to be safer; too many people were dying in the workplace. If any of you have ever spent any time in a factory, seen people walking around without all their fingers, you can appreciate that.

But it was also a time when we became profoundly disillusioned because of Watergate and a lot of other things. We really began to suspect that we couldn't trust our leaders or our institutions. And it was the beginning of the decline of middle class dreams for middle class people. In the sixties, the riots in the cities showed that more and more poor people began to doubt whether they would ever be able to work their way into the middle class. In the seventies, people who were in the middle class began to worry about whether they would ever be able to

stay or what that meant. It began 20 years ago.

Then in the eighties, it was also a very mixed bag. It was a time when people exalted greed and short-term profit. It was a time when we built in by bipartisan conspiracy in this community the first structural deficit in the history of the United States of America and exploded our debt while we were reducing our investment in our most profound problems, while we spent the tax cuts and behaved just like the rest of the country, worrying about the short-run. But it was also a time, let's not forget where all across the country, there was a renewed awareness of the dangers of drugs and drug use began to go down, smoking declined, volunteerism increased. And there was a remarkable explosion of productivity in the industrial sector in America, and the American economy began to go through the changes necessary to be competitive.

In the nineties, everybody knows, I think, that there's been a sort of a sobering increase in personal values of commitment. You see it in the decline in the divorce rate and the increase in healthy habits among many people. You see more commitment expressed in groups and by individuals all across the country. You see it in people reaffirming their commitment to the families in small and large ways, the remarkable husband and wife minister team that I introduced in the State of the Union, the Reverend Cherrys and their AME Zion Church near here, now one of the two or three biggest churches in America founded on family outreach. The phenomenal success of this promise-keepers organization—you can fill any football stadium in America. It's an astonishing thing because people want to do the right thing. And they want to get their families and their lives back together. And that's encouraging.

But let us not forget that these profound problems endure. Middle class dreams and middle class values, the things which have shaped our life and our experience and our expectations, are still very, very much at risk.

I will say again: We have all these aggregate indices that the economy has done well: almost 7 million new jobs, the stock market's over 4,500, all the things that you know. But while average income has gone up, median

income, the person in the middle, has declined in the last 2 years. A sense of job security has declined with all the downsizing. More and more people are temporary workers. This is the only advanced country in the world where there's a smaller percentage of people under 65 in the work force with health insurance today than 10 years ago.

Millions of American people go home at night from their work and sit down to dinner and look at their children and wonder what they have done wrong, what did they ever do to fail. And they're riddled with worries about it. Millions more who are poor have simply given up on ever being able to work their way into a stable lifestyle. And that, doubtless, is fueling some of the disturbing increase in casual drug use among very young people and the rise in violence among young people. That threatens middle class values.

In almost every major city in America the crime rate is down. Hallelujah! In almost every place in America, the rate of random violence among young people is up, even as the overall crime rate drops. Government is struggling to change, and I'm proud of the changes we have made. But no one really believes that Government is fully adjusted to the demands of the 21st century and the information age. It clearly must still be less bureaucratic, more empowering, rely more on incentives if we still have to reduce spending and we have to find a way to do it while increasing our investment in the things that will determine our ability to live middle class dreams.

Politics has become more and more fractured, just like the rest of our lives; pluralized. It's exciting in some ways. But as we divide into more and more and more sharply defined organized groups around more and more and more stratified issues, as we communicate more and more with people in extreme rhetoric through mass mailings or sometimes semi-hysterical messages right before election on the telephone or 30-second ads designed far more to inflame than to inform, as we see politicians actually getting language lessons on how to turn their adversaries into aliens, it is difficult to draw the conclusion that our political system is producing the sort of discussion that will give us the kind of results we need.

But our citizens, even though their confidence in the future has been clouded and their doubts about their leaders and their institutions are profound, want something better. You could see it in the way they turned out for the town meetings in 1992. You could see it in the overwhelming, I mean literally overwhelming, response that I have received from people of all political parties to the simple act of having a decent, open conversation with the Speaker of the House in Claremont, New Hampshire. People know we need to do better. And deep down inside, our people know this is a very great country capable of meeting our challenges.

So what are the conclusions I draw from this? First of all, don't kid yourself. There are real reasons for ordinary voters to be angry, frustrated, and downright disoriented. How could our politics not be confusing when people's lives are so confusing and frustrating and seem to be so full of contradictory developments?

Secondly, this is now, as it has ever been, fertile ground for groups that claim a monopoly on middle class values and old-fashioned virtue. And it's easy to blame the Government when people don't feel any positive results. It's easy to blame groups of others when people have to have somebody to blame for their own problems when they are working as hard as they can, and they can't keep up.

But there is real reason for hope, my fellow Americans. This is, after all, the most productive country in the world. We do a better job of dealing with racial and ethnic diversity and trying to find some way to bring out the best in all of our people than any other country with this much diversity in the world.

We have an environment that is cleaner and safer and healthier than it used to be. We still have the lead in many important areas that will determine the shape of societies in the 21st century. There is a real willingness among our people to try bold change. And most important of all, most Americans are still living by middle class values and hanging on to middle class dreams. And everywhere in this country there are examples of people who have taken their future into their own hands, worked with their friends and neighbors, broken through bureaucracy,

and solved problems. If there is anything I would say to you it is that you can find somewhere in America, somebody who has solved every problem you are worried about.

So there is reason for hope. And I would say, to me the real heroes in this country are the people that are out there making things work and the people who show up for work every day, even though they're barely at and maybe even below the poverty line, but they still work full-time, obey the law, pay their taxes, and raise their kids the best they can. That's what this country is really all about. And so there is really no cause for the kind of hand-wringing and cynicism that dominates too much of the public debate today.

What do we have to do now? First of all, we've got to have this debate that is looming over Washington. We have to have it. It's a good thing. We are debating things now we thought were settled for decades. We are now back to fundamental issues that were debated like this 50, 60, 70 years ago. There is a group who believe that our problems are primarily personal and cultural. Cultural is a—basically a word that means, in this context, there are a whole lot of persons doing the same bad thing. [Laughter] And that's what people—and then if everybody would just sort of straighten up and fly right, why, things would be hunky-dory. And why don't they do it?

Now, I—you can see that with just two reasons—I'll give you two examples. And I made you laugh, but let's be serious. These people are honest and genuine in their beliefs. I will give you two examples that are sort of—stand out, but there are hundred more that are more modulated: The NRA's position on gun violence, the Brady bill, and the assault weapons ban. Their position is guns don't kill people, people do. Find the people who do wrong, throw them in jail, and throw the key away. Punish wrongdoers. Do not infringe upon my right to keep and bear arms, even to keep and bear arsenals or artillery or assault weapons. Do not do that because I have not done anything wrong, and I have no intention of doing anything wrong. Why are you making me wait 5 days to get a handgun? What do you care if I want an AK-47 or an Uzi to go out and engage



in some sort of sporting contest to see who's a better shot? I obey the law. I pay my taxes. I don't give you any grief. Why are you on my back. The Constitution says I can do this. Punish wrongdoers. I am sick and tired of my life being inconvenienced for what other people do.

Second example is the one that dominated the headlines in the last couple of days, what Senator Helms said about AIDS, "I'm sick and tired of spending money on research and treatment for a disease that could be ended tomorrow if everybody just straightened up and fly right. I'm tired of it. Why should I spend taxpayer—I've got a budget to balance. We're cutting aid to Africa. We're cutting education. We're cutting Medicare. Why should we spend money on treatment and research for a disease that is a product of people's wrongdoing? Illicit sex and bad drugs, dirty needles—let's just stop it."

Now, at one level, forgetting about those two examples, this argument is self-evidently right. Go back to what I told you about my family. A lot of you are nodding your heads about yours. There is a sense in which there is nothing the Government can do for anybody that will displace the negative impact of personal misconduct. And unless people are willing to work hard and do the best they can and advance themselves and their families, the ability of common action, no matter how well-meaning, won't work.

You look at every social program that's working in every community, and there are lots of them. I was just in New Haven for the opening of the Special Olympics, and I spent a lot of time with the LEAP program up there. It's an incredible program where these college students work with inner-city kids in the cities helping them rebuild their lives. But if the kids don't want to do it and won't behave, there's nothing these college kids can do to help them. So let's give them that. At a certain level, this is self-evidently true.

But what is the problem? These problems are our problems. They're not just single problems. If there's a big crime rate and a whole lot of people getting killed with guns, that affects all the rest of us because some of us are likely to get shot.

Now, I see the Brady bill in a totally different way because I see these problems as community problems. And I think a public response is all right. And I think saying to people who have the line I said, I think we ought to say to people, "Look, it is just not out of line for you to be asked to undergo the minor inconvenience of waiting 5 days to get a handgun, until we can computerize all the records, because, look here, in the last year and a half, there are 40,000 people who had criminal records or mental health histories who didn't get handguns, and they're not out there shooting people because you went through a minor inconvenience. You don't gripe when you go through a metal detector at an airport anymore, because you are very aware of the connection between this minor inconvenience to you and the fact that the plane might blow up, and you don't want that plane to blow up or be hijacked."

Well, look at the level of violence in America. It's the same thing. I don't have a problem with saying, "Look, these assault weapons are primarily designed to kill people. That's their primary purpose. And I'm sorry if you don't have a new one that you can take out in the woods somewhere to a shooting contest, but you'll get over it. Shoot with something else." [Laughter] "It's worth it." [Applause] I'm glad you're clapping. I'm glad you agree with me, but remember, the other people are good people who honestly believe what they say. That's the importance of this debate. It's the attitudes. We have to—we're having this debate.

The NRA that I knew as a child, the NRA that I knew as a Governor, for years, were the people who did hunter education programs, the people that helped me resolve land boundary disputes when retirees would come to the mountains in the northern part of my State and go into unincorporated areas, and who could and couldn't hunt on whose land. And they actually helped save people's lives, and they solved a lot of problems. I mean this is a different—these are deeply held world views about working—but the way I look at it is it's like the airport metal detector.

I'll give you another example. It might not be popular in this group. I agree with the

Supreme Court decision on requiring people who want to be on high school athletic teams to take drug tests, not because I think all kids are bad, not because I think they all use drugs, but because casual drug use is going up among young people again. It is a privilege to play on the football team. It is a privilege to be in the band. It is a privilege to have access to all these activities. And I say it's like going through the airport metal detector. You ought to be willing to do that to help get the scourge of drugs out of your school and keep kids off drugs. That's what I believe, because I see it as a common problem. So we all have to give up a little and go through a little inconvenience to help solve problems and pull the country together and push it forward. But this is a huge debate.

Look at the AIDS debate. You may think it's a little harder. First of all, the truth is not everybody who has AIDS gets it from sex or drug needles. I've got a picture on my desk at the White House of a little boy named Ricky Ray. He and his family were treated horribly by people who were afraid of AIDS when they first got it through blood transfusions, he and his brother. And he died right after my election. I keep his picture on my table to remember that. Elizabeth Glaser was a good friend of mine. She and the daughter she lost and her wonderful son that survived her, they didn't get AIDS through misconduct. So that's just wrong. I know a fine woman doctor in Texas who got AIDS because she was treating AIDS patients and she got the tiniest pinprick in her finger, a million to one, 2 million to one chance. But secondly, and more to the point, the gay people who have AIDS are still our sons, our brothers, our cousins, our citizens. They're Americans, too. They're obeying the law and working hard. They're entitled to be treated like everybody else. And the drug users, there's nobody in this country that hates that any more than I do because I've lived with it in my family. But I fail to see why we would want to hasten people's demise because they paid a terrible price for their abuse.

You know, smoking causes lung cancer, but we don't propose to stop treating lung cancer or stop doing research to find a cure.

Right? Drunk driving causes a lot of highway deaths, but we don't propose to stop trying to make cars safer. Do we? I don't think so.

So I just disagree with this. Why do we have to make this choice? Why can't we say to people, look, you've got to behave if you want your life to work, but we have common problems, and we are going to have some common responses. I don't understand why it's got to be an either/or thing. That's not the way we live our lives. Why should we conduct our public debates in this way?

And the best example of all to me that our problems are both personal and cultural and economic, political and social is the whole condition of the middle class economically. I think it requires public and private decisionmaking. Family values, most families have them. But most families are working harder for less so they have less time and less money to spend with their children. Now, that's just a fact. That's not good for family values. And I don't believe exhortation alone can turn it around. It's going to require some common action. I think that what we did with the family leave law supported family values. I think that we can have a welfare reform law that requires parental responsibility, has tough work requirements, but invests in child care and supports family values.

I think we can have a tax system that gives breaks to people to help them raise their kids and educate themselves and their children, and that would support family values. I think we can have an education system that empowers people to make the most of their own lives, and I think that is profoundly supportive of family values. And I do not believe the Government can do it alone. I believe there are other things that have to be done by people themselves and also by employers.

One of our major newspapers had an article yesterday on the front page, or the day before, saying in the new world economy the employers call all the shots, talking about how more and more workers were temporary workers, more and more people felt insecure. You know, it's all very well to exhort people. But if they're out there really busting it, doing everything they can and falling further behind, and they're not being treated fairly by people who can afford to treat them fairly, then that's something else again, isn't it?

The global economy, automation, the decline of unionization, and the inadequate response of too many employers to these changes have led to a profound weakening of the condition of many American workers. There aren't many companies like NUCOR, a nonunion company, a steel company, where people get a fairly low base hourly wage, but they get a weekly bonus; nobody's ever been laid off; every employee with a college kid, student—a child who's college age, gets about \$2,500 a year as a college allowance; and the pay of the executives is tied to the performance of the company and cannot go up by a higher percentage than the pay of the workers goes up.

Now, by contrast, in the 12 years before I took office—this is all in the private sector—the top management of our companies' pay went up by 4 times what their workers' pay went up and 3 times what their profits went up percentage-wise. And that trend has largely continued, if anything accelerated, even though we limited the tax subsidy for it in 1993.

So I would say to you that there are some things that mere exhortation to good conduct will not solve, that require other responses that are public or that are private but go beyond just saying these are personal or cultural problems.

I also think that if we want to maintain a public response, there must be a relentless effort to change but not to eviscerate the Government. We have tried weak Government, nonexistent Government, in a complex industrial society where powerful interests that are driven only by short-term considerations call all the shots. We tried it decades and decades ago. It didn't work out very well. It didn't even produce a very good economic policy. It had something to do with the onset of the depression.

On the other hand, we know that an insensitive, overly bureaucratic, yesterday-oriented, special-interest-dominated Government can be just as big a nightmare. We've done what we could to change that. The Government has 150,000 fewer people working today than it did when I took office. We've gotten rid of thousands of regulations and hundreds of programs. We have a few shining stars like the Small Business Administra-

tion, which today has a budget that's 40 percent lower than it did when I took office, that's making twice as many loans, has dramatically increased the loans to women and minorities, has not decreased loans to white males, and hasn't made a loan to a single unqualified person.

We can do these things. I wish I had all day to talk to you about what the Secretary of Education has done in the Education Department to try to make it work better and make common sense and involve parents and promote things like greater choice of schools and the building of charter schools and character education in the schools. It's not an either/or thing. You don't have to choose between being personally right and having common goals.

So that's my side of the argument. That's why I think my New Covenant formulation is better to solve the problems of middle class dreams and middle class values than the Republican contract. But perhaps the most important thing is not whether I'm right or they are, the important thing is how are we going to resolve this and what are citizens going to do. How can we resolve the debate?

I believe—and you've got to decide whether you believe this—I believe that a democracy requires a certain amount of common ground. I do not believe you can solve complex questions like this at the grassroots level or at the national level or anywhere in between if you have too much extremism of rhetoric and excessive partisanship. Times are changing too fast. We need to keep our eyes open. We need to keep our ears open. We need to be flexible. We need to have new solutions based on old values. I just don't think we can get there unless we can establish some common ground.

And that seems to me to impose certain specific responsibilities on citizens and on political leaders. And if I might, just let me say them. They may be painfully self-evident, but I don't think they're irrelevant. Every citizen in this country's got to say, what do I have to do for myself or my family, or nothing else counts. The truth is that nobody can repeal the laws of the global economy, and people that don't have a certain level of education and skills are not going to be employable in good jobs with long-term prospects.

And that's just a fact. The truth is that if every child in this country had both parents contributing to his or her support and nourishment and emotional stability and education and future, we'd have almost no poor kids, instead of having over 20 percent of our children born in poverty. Those things are true.

The second thing is, more of our citizens have got to say, what should I do in my community? You know, it's not just enough to bemoan the rising crime rate or how kids are behaving and whatever. That's just not enough. It is not enough. Not when you have example after example after example from this LEAP program I mentioned, the "I Have A Dream" program, to the world-famous Habitat for Humanity program, to all these local initiatives, support corporations, that are now going around the country, revolutionizing slum housing and giving poor, working people decent places to live, to the work of the Catholic social missions in Washington, DC, and other places.

It is not enough to say that. People have to ask themselves: What should I be doing through my church or my community organizations? People who feel very strongly about one of the most contentious issues in our society, abortion, ought to look at the United Pentecostal Church. They'll adopt any child born, no matter what race, no matter how disabled, no matter what their problems are. There is a positive, constructive outlet for people who are worried about every problem in this country if they will go seek it out. And there is nothing the rest of us can do that will replace that kind of energy.

The fourth thing that I think—the third thing I think citizens have to do that is also important, people have to say, "What is my job as a citizen who is a voter? I am in control here. I run the store. I get to throw this crowd out on a regular basis. That's a big responsibility. We're the board of directors of America. Are we making good decisions? Are we making good decisions? Do we approach these decisions in the right frame of mind? Do we have enough information? Do we know what we're doing?"

I can tell you, the American people are hungry for information. When I announced my balanced budget and we put it on the Internet, one of our people at the White

House told me there were a few hours when we were getting 50,000 requests an hour. The American people want to know things.

So I say to every citizen, do you have the information you need? Do you ever have a discussion with somebody that's different from you, not just people who agree with you but somebody who's different? You ever listen to one of those radio programs that has the opposite point of view of yours, even if you have to grind your teeth? [Laughter] And what kind of language do you use when you talk to people who are of different political parties with different views? Is it the language of respect or the language of a suspect? How do you deal with people? This is a huge thing. What do you have to do for yourself and your family? What can you do in your community? What can you do as a citizen?

Thomas Jefferson said he had no fear of the most extreme views in America being expressed with the greatest passion as long as reason had a chance—as long as reason had a chance. Citizens have to give reason a chance.

What do the political leaders have to do? I would argue four things: Number one, we need more conversation and less combat; number two, when we differ we ought to offer an alternative; number three, we ought to look relentlessly at the long-term and remind the American people that the problems we have developed over a long period years; and number four, we shouldn't just berate the worst in America, we ought to spend more time celebrating the best.

Those are four things that I think I should do, and I think every other leader in this country ought to do. Conversation, not combat is what I tried to do with the Speaker in New Hampshire, and I want to do more of it with others. I'm willing if they are. I think it would be good for America.

Secondly, differ but present an alternative. That's why I presented a balanced budget. A lot of people said, "This is dumb politics." The Republicans won the Congress by just saying no: No to deficit reduction, and call it a tax increase. Run away from your own health care plan, say they're trying to make the Government take over health care. That

may be. But that's because this is a confusing time. It's still not the right thing to do.

Americans don't want "just say no" politics. If they can get the truth, they'll make the right decision 99 times out of 100. And we have to offer an alternative. And so do they. We all should. When we differ, we should say what we're for, not just what we're against.

The third thing is important, looking for the long-term. I was really sad in 1994. I'll be honest with you, on election day I was sad. I kind of felt sorry for myself. I thought, "Gosh, you know, the real problems in this country are these income problems," and "Look what we've done with the family leave law. We cut taxes for families with incomes under \$28,000 a year by \$1,000 a year. We've done," and I reeled it all off. And I said, "Gosh, I feel terrible." And then I realized, how could they possibly feel anything in 2 years? These income trends are huge, huge trends; huge, sweeping over two decades; fast international forces behind them; trillions of dollars of money moving across international borders working to find the lowest labor cost and pressing down; untold improvements in automation; so fast that you just can't create enough high-wage jobs to overcome the ones that are being depressed in some sectors of the economy. These are a huge deal. How could people have felt that? Nonetheless, our job is not to get reelected; it's to think about the long-term because the problems are long-term problems.

I want to read you what President Havel said in his Harvard commencement speech about this—more eloquent than anything I could say. "The main task of the present generation of politicians is not, I think, to ingratiate themselves with the public through the decisions they take or their smiles on television. Their role is something quite different, to assume their share of responsibility for the long-range prospects of our world, and thus, to set an example for the public in whose sight they work. After all, politics is a matter of serving the community which means that it is morality in practice." I could hardly have said it better.

Fourth, maybe the most important thing is, we should not just condemn the worst, we ought to find the best and celebrate it,

and then, relentlessly promote it as a model to be followed. You know, I kept President Bush's Points of Light Foundation when I became President. And we recognize those people every year because I believe in that. I always—I thought that was one of the best things he did. But I tried to institutionalize it in many ways.

That's what AmeriCorps is all about. The national service program gives young people a chance to earn money for college by working in grassroots community projects all across the country. When I was in New Haven at the LEAP program, I had AmeriCorps volunteers there. I was in Texas the other day walking the streets of an inner city and a girl with a college degree from another State was there working with welfare mothers because she was raised by a welfare mother who taught her to go to school, work hard, and get a college degree, and she did.

We have to find a way to systematically see these things that work sweep across this country with high standards and high expectations and breaking through all this bureaucracy that keeps people from achieving. We can do that. And the President ought to do even more than I have done to celebrate the things that work, and I intend to do it and to do more of it.

Now I believe, obviously, that my New Covenant approach is better than the Republican contract approach to deal with the problems of middle class dreams and middle class values. But when I ran for this job, I said I wanted to restore the American dream and to bring the American people together. I have now come to the conclusion, having watched this drama unfold here and all around our country in the last 2½ years, that I cannot do the first unless we can do the latter. We can't restore the American dream unless we can find some way to bring the American people closer together. Therefore, how we resolve these differences is as important as what specific position we advocate.

I think we have got to move beyond division and resentment to common ground. We've got to go beyond cynicism to a sense of possibility. America is an idea. We're not one race. We're not one ethnic group. We're not one religious group. We do share a common piece of ground here. But you read the

Declaration of Independence and the Constitution: This country is an idea. And it is still going now in our 220th year because we all had a sense of possibility. We never thought there was a mountain we couldn't climb, a river we couldn't ford, or a problem we couldn't solve. What's that great line in the wonderful new movie, "Apollo 13," "Failure is not an option." You have to believe in possibility. And if you're cynical, you can't believe in possibility.

We need to respect our differences and hear them, but it means instead of having shrill voices of discord, we need a chorus of harmony. In a chorus of harmony you know there are lots of differences, but you can hear all the voices. And that is important.

And we've got to challenge every American in every sector of our society to do their part. We have to challenge in a positive way and hold accountable people who claim to be not responsible for any consequences of their actions that they did not specifically intend, whether it's in government, business, labor, entertainment, the media, religion, or community organizations. None of us can say we're not accountable for our actions because we did not intend those consequences, even if we made some contribution to them.

Two days ago, on July the 4th, the people of Oklahoma City raised their flags and their spirits to full mast for the first time since the awful tragedy of April 19th. Governor Keating and Mayor Norick led a celebration in Oklahoma City, which some of you may have seen on television, a celebration of honor and thanks for thousands of Oklahomans and other Americans who showed up and stood united in the face of that awful hatred and loss for what is best in our country.

You know, Oklahoma City took a lot of the meanness out of America. It gave us a chance for more sober reflection. It gave us a chance to come to the same conclusion that Thomas Jefferson did in his first inaugural. I want to read this to you with only this bit of history. Thomas Jefferson was elected the first time by the House of Representatives in a bitterly contested election in the first outbreak of completely excessive partisanship in American history. In that sense it was a time not unlike this time. And this is what

he said, "Let us unite with our heart and mind. Let us restore to social intercourse that harmony and affection without which liberty and life itself are but dreary things."

We can redeem the promise of America for our children. We can certainly restore the American family for another full century if we commit to each other, as the Founders did, our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor. In our hour of greatest peril and the greatest division when we were fighting over the issue which we still have not fully resolved, Abraham Lincoln said, "We are not enemies but friends. We must not be enemies."

My friends, amidst all our differences, let us find a new, common ground.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:24 a.m. in Gaston Hall. In his remarks, he referred to Father Leo J. O'Donovan, president, Georgetown University; Gov. Frank Keating of Oklahoma; and Mayor Ronald Norick of Oklahoma City, OK.

## **Remarks to the National Education Association**

*July 6, 1995*

I want to thank you for your kind introduction and even more for your many years of distinguished leadership for our children, our schools, our parents and, of course, for our teachers. And to all of you delegates, I want to thank you for the support you have given to our administration to help us to get here and to help us honor our commitments to the children, the teachers, and the future of America.

I also want to thank you for the high honor you paid my good friend, Secretary Riley, by naming him your 1995 Friend of Education. I don't have to tell you that education has no better friend than Secretary Riley. I'm proud to have him in my Cabinet, and I'm proud to have worked with him for nearly 20 years now. He's actually doing what others say we ought to be doing. He's supporting more parental involvement. He's supporting higher standards and results-oriented programs. He's supporting accountability, but he's also supporting grassroots empowerment for teachers, for parents, and for

local schools throughout this country. He is really making a difference, and he deserves the support of all Americans and all Members of Congress, without regard for their party.

You know, of course, that the Vice President very much wanted to be with you today. But of course, his mother fell ill and had to have surgery yesterday. I'm happy to report to you that of this morning Mrs. Gore is doing much better. She is a remarkable woman. Many years ago she was the first woman lawyer in Texarkana, Arkansas. So I've always thought we've sort of had a claim on her, too. I know all of you join Hillary and me in praying for Mrs. Gore in her speedy recovery, and for her husband, Senator Gore, and for Al and Tipper and their entire family.

I'd like to begin this morning by just taking a few minutes to talk about what I said when I spoke at Georgetown University a couple of hours ago. It's something I believe I should be talking about more as President.

When I ran for this office, I said I wanted to do two things: first of all, to restore the American dream and, secondly, to bring the American people together again. What I've learned from the journey we've been on for the last 2½ years is that we cannot restore the American dream unless we do bring the American people together again.

You and I and all Americans must talk about how we treat one another, how we reach the hard decisions we have to make during this time of profound change, how we bridge these great divides in our society. We have got to find a way to reach common ground, a new common ground that honors our diversity, but recognizes our shared values and shared interests, drawing strength from both to make the very best of what we can do in America. We have to recognize that there are real reasons why Americans feel that our sense of unity and national purpose is coming apart, why they often feel frustration and anger and confusion.

The challenges of this day are new and profound, as profound as any we have faced in many, many decades. For most people my age and a little younger, two great certainties organized our lives. They've organized the lives of Americans for most of the last half-

century: first, the hope of middle class dreams; and second, the strength of middle class values.

Today more and more Americans are less certain of both. The middle class dream that work will be rewarded and that the future for our children will be better is fading for too many people. More than half of all of our people are working harder to earn less than they did 15 or 20 years ago. And middle class values, the values of hard work, strong families, safe streets, secure future, those things are under attack, too, as we face threats from violence, the breakdown of families, the fraying of our social fabric, the very pace and scope of changes in this technological information age, where ideas and money and information move across the globe in a fraction of a second.

The question, of course, is what are we going to do about this. That's what I've been working on for 2 years, and that's the fundamental debate now going on in Washington. And we need to have that debate not just here in Washington, but all over the country.

We're really back to some pretty elemental principles. Some people argue that our real problems are all social and personal and cultural problems. So they say if everybody would just get up, go to work, behave themselves, obey the law, all of our problems would be solved. Now, on one level they're obviously right. Our problems can never be solved through purely political and community means. I've said all along, we've got to demand more responsibility from America, from all Americans. Unless people are willing to take responsibility for themselves, as every teacher knows, you can't cram information, learning, reasoning, compassion, or good citizenship into the head of someone who won't be open to it.

But at the same time, let's be completely frank. It's also true that nobody in America, no one, especially me, got where he or she is today alone. To believe otherwise is foolish. We all have to play a role, individual citizens in their daily lives, people doing their part to help make their communities stronger, their neighbors safer, politicians in the way they deal with and address our problems. We've all got to do a better job. And I believe

we have to recognize that one of the ways we all do more together is through the way our Government works and what it does to help our people meet the demands of change.

This is not an either/or thing. This is not "are these problems personal and cultural, on the one hand, or social and political on the other." That's not the way the world works. It's both. And there is a role, a partnership role for the Government to help you do what you do and to help all Americans make the most of their own lives.

Education is perhaps the best example of this. It's the work of your lives, but it's also the work of America's future. All of these concerns come together in education because school is where young people can learn the skills they need to pursue middle class dreams, especially now when knowledge is more important than ever to our future. School is also the place where middle class values taught by parents are reinforced by teachers, values like responsibility, honesty, trustworthiness, hard work, caring for one another and our natural environment, and good citizenship.

Government plays an indispensable role in helping to make sure that the schools that you work in are as strong as possible, have the highest standards possible, provide as much opportunity as possible. The dynamic is pretty simple. A good education clearly is key to unlocking the promise of today's economy in the 21st century. Without it, people are at an ever-increasing risk of falling behind.

Today, a male college graduate earns 80 percent more than a male who's just graduated from high school. That gap is double what it was just in 1979. That's why I have been fighting furiously since the day I took office to expand educational opportunity, to give all Americans a chance to grab the key to a prosperous future. As you know well, we have dramatically expanded Head Start. We passed Goals 2000 to set world-class standards for our schools and then to give grassroots reform power to empower, really empower teachers and principals and parents to give them the flexibility to decide how to meet those standards and how to improve education.

Our national service program, AmeriCorps, gives a helping hand with college for 20,000 people who are helping their country in grassroots programs all across America. The Safe and Drug-Free Schools initiative is helping to make schools safe, places where kids can learn again and be free from fear, places where parents can trust their children to be free from crime and drugs. Our direct student loan program makes college more affordable for millions of Americans while actually cutting the cost for taxpayers.

Now, there is one piece of this that is especially important for us to talk about today. As I noted before you've just honored Dick Riley. I want to commend him for so many things, but in particular for the work the Education Department is doing to teach our children good citizenship and the values we need to stay strong. There is something that we need to remember about that Department of Education that Dick Riley is now heading and heading in the right direction. Just 18 years ago yesterday, on July 5, 1977, two sons of Minnesota, Vice President Mondale and former Vice President Hubert Humphrey, shared the same stage at another NEA convention.

Now back in 1977, you all know that education policy in America fell under the giant umbrella of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a huge bureaucratic agency responsible for health care policy and welfare responsibility, and all the educational responsibilities, whether it was keeping our classrooms up to date, ensuring our public schools had the tools they need to teach our children, maintaining high curriculum standards, giving special-needs schools and special-needs students the support they need. All those things were all lumped in to this massive bureaucracy that was Health, Education, and Welfare.

That wasn't in the best interest of public education then. It's certainly not in the best interest of the country today when education is literally the key to our economic future, to restoring middle class dreams. And it's certainly critical to reestablishing the dominance of middle class values.

At that historic meeting, Vice President Humphrey made a passionate plea, and he was a very passionate man, for something the



NEA had been fighting for for over 100 years, a Cabinet-level Department of Education. America's children would have only 2 more years to wait. The bill creating the Cabinet-level Department of Education was signed by President Carter in October 1979.

In the last 2½ years, Secretary Riley, a former Governor who labored for 8 years to dramatically improve schools in his native South Carolina, has worked hard to make the Department of Education work better than ever. We need the Department of Education today more than ever before. And we need it even more because Dick Riley has literally reinvented it. It is less bureaucratic. It is smaller. Programs have been consolidated. But he is focusing on the big issues, whether it is the pre-school needs of our kids, the standards in the grassroots reform we need in public schools, the need we have for school-to-work transition programs in every State in the country, the need we have for expanded and lower-cost and better repayment college loans, or the need he has to cooperate with the Department of Education to give our working people the right to get the training they need the minute they become unemployed because now so many of them will have to find new jobs with higher skills. That is the record of Dick Riley; that is the record of the Department of Education; and that is why we need it.

As all of you know, during this time when we have increased our investments in education, we have also cut the deficit 3 years in a row for the first time since Harry Truman was President. We're cutting it by more than a trillion dollars over 7 years. We're also cutting the bureaucracy of the National Government over a 6-year period by more than 272,000 positions to make the Federal Government the smallest it's been since President Kennedy was President.

Let me tell you just how dramatic the changes have already been in 2½ years. The Government is already 150,000 people smaller. We have eliminated thousands and thousands of regulations, including regulations in the Department of Education. We have eliminated hundreds of Government programs. And the budget would be balanced today but for the interest we have to pay on

just the debt run up the 12 years before I became President.

But we can't stop there. We must continue to cut the deficit until we eliminate it completely and balance the budget. That is why I have proposed a plan to balance the budget in 10 years. While cutting spending to balance the budget, however, under my plan we would continue to invest in our people especially in education.

We must not sacrifice the future of our children in our zeal to save it. But let me also say to you that I know a lot of people who want to invest more money in our country question whether we actually need a balanced budget. They questioned my wisdom when I proposed a balanced budget. But let me ask you to look at the history of America.

We ran deficits all during the 1970's, but we did it for good economic reasons. That was a period of stagflation, of low growth, a period when it was legitimate to stimulate the economy in a modest way by modest deficits. We never, I reemphasize, never in the history of our Republic had a permanent structural deficit until 1981. After that, a lot of the people who got the tax cuts spent them and there was no way to reach a bipartisan consensus to lower the gap in the deficit. So we quadrupled the debt of this country in 12 years. We're 219 years old, and we've quadrupled the debt in 12 years. Now, we have to change that.

Look what's happened to you. Every year in the 1980's, you had to fight to hold on to the educational advances. Every year when you knew that we needed to be investing more because many parents were able to invest less in terms of money and time in their children's education, you were often disappointed because we were spending more and more and more in interest on the debt.

Next year, interest on the debt will exceed the defense budget. That's how big a problem it is. It makes us poorer. It takes our savings. It makes us more dependent on other economies. And it leaves us less money to invest in education, in infrastructure, in technology, in the things that will grow jobs, raise incomes, increase the middle class, and shrink the under class.

So what we have to do is to balance the budget and increase investment in education.

That's why I made the decision to veto the rescission bill that Congress sent me earlier last month. But it's also why I gave them an alternative. I am determined to work with the new Congress to cut the deficit and ultimately to balance the budget. But that rescission bill cut investments in our future, in education, in job training, in the environment, just to fund things that have a far lower value, even though they may be popular in the short-term with specific constituencies.

Now that Congress has agreed to restore funding for those investments, I'll be happy to sign a bill. It will cut the deficit, and that's good. But we'll also have \$733 million in this year alone in critical investments, including \$220 million for safe and drug-free schools, \$60 million to help train teachers and pay for education reforms at the grassroots level, \$105 million for AmeriCorps.

As we work in the coming months to balance the budget, we have to do it in the same way. You and I know it would be self-defeating to cut our investments in education. Cutting education today would be like cutting defense budgets at the height of the cold war. Our national security depends upon our ability to educate better, not just to spend more money but to reach more people, to perform at a higher level, to get real results. That's what our security depends upon.

But don't kid yourselves, we've got a real fight on our hands. The congressional budget, which balances the budget in 7 years, cuts education severely, as Keith Geiger just said. My budget, which balances the budget in 10 years, increases education while cutting other spending.

We're also able to go easier on Medicare and Medicaid, to take some real time and promote real health care reform, and to continue to invest in new technologies and research. All we have to do is take 3 more years and cut the size of that big tax cut roughly in half, maybe a little more.

Now, I think 3 years is a pretty small price to pay to save millions and millions of dreams. Let me just give you a few examples of the difference 3 years will make. I want to increase Goals 2000 to about \$900 million so that you will be able to work to improve 85,000 schools serving 44 million students. The congressional budget would eliminate

Goals 2000, one of the principal engines of grassroots reform, something they say they support.

I want to increase Title I by over \$200 million in 1996 to serve 200,000 more children that year. Let me just say something about Title I and your efforts. All the time up here I hear the politicians saying we just throw money at education, and it doesn't get any results, and we spend more money and we don't show more results. Well, as the Secretary of Labor has pointed out there are public investments in children and private investments in children. We pretty well kept up with our public investments, but our private investments aren't keeping up. More and more of these children are being born in poverty, a higher percentage of them into difficult family circumstances and difficult neighborhood circumstances. And even those who have working parents have parents, most of whom are working longer hours for less money. That means that parents have less money and less time to invest in our kids. That's a much bigger burden for you to bear.

Now, the Congress wants to freeze funding and deprive over one million children of the help that you can provide by 2002. I believe the money will make a difference because I know that you can make a difference. You can't make all the difference for what doesn't happen in the family, but you ought to get a lot of credit for trying and for the difference that you do make.

I want to increase the School-to-Work program by 60 percent next year so 43 States can help thousands of students learn the skills they need to get and keep high-paying jobs, even when they don't go on to 4-year universities. We're the only major industrialized country that does not have a system for dealing with all of the high school graduates who don't go on to four-year schools. Now, the Congress wants to cut it to half that amount.

I think that's being penny-wise and pound-foolish. I want to expand AmeriCorps to 50,000 people next year. Congress has proposed to eliminate it completely. I know that's a big mistake. Those 20,000 young people that are out there now, working with each other across the lines of race and region and religion and income are revolutionizing

America at the grassroots level, solving problems, serving their communities, being good citizens, doing things that other people just give talks about, and earning money to pay for their education. We ought to keep national service, and we ought to expand it.

We've reformed the college loan system to make college more affordable for up to 20 million Americans. Secretary Riley has done a masterful job along with his staff, in administering the direct loan program, which actually increases the availability of loans, lowers the cost to students, lowers the paper-work burden to colleges and universities, and cuts the cost to the taxpayers.

Now, the congressional majority wants to cut \$10 billion from the student loan program by removing the interest subsidy during the time of the student's education which will raise costs significantly for up to 7 million students. In the 1980's, the cost of a college education was the only thing that went up more rapidly than the cost of health care among the essential things that families need for the future. I don't think it's a very good idea to cut the college loan program. There are other ways to save the money.

Here's the bottom line. Under my plan, we balance the budget and increase educational investment by \$40 billion in proven programs that work. The plan of the Republican majority in Congress balances the budget, but it cuts education by \$36 billion, not counting the cuts in student loans.

Now, I'm not for a minute suggesting that balancing the budget is easy. Even under my plan, there will be plenty of pain to go around. We'll have to cut spending in other domestic programs about 20 percent across the board. But the difference between my plan and the congressional plan is the difference between necessary cutbacks and unnecessary, ultimately self-defeating pain. One distinguished business analysis has said that the Republican budget cuts so much so fast that it will actually increase unemployment and bring on a recession and, therefore, delay the time when they can balance the budget.

Now, we do have a responsibility to balance the budget. And I give them a lot of credit for proposing a balanced budget. But we've also got a responsibility to invest in our

children and our future. We cannot restore the economy, we cannot rebuild the middle class, we can't recapture middle class dreams or reinforce middle class values if we walk away from our common responsibilities, the education of our people.

If we'll just take 10 years instead of 7, if we cut taxes for the middle class and focus on child-rearing and education, and don't have big tax cuts for people who don't really need it because they're well-off and doing very well in this economy, then we can balance the budget and improve education. We can do both, and that's what I want you to fight for.

Our mission, your mission and mine, has got to be to build a bridge to the future that every American can cross. We have to give people the power they need to make the most of their own lives. That is what's behind this, balancing the budget and investing in education means building up America. And it's behind what I called for earlier today at Georgetown, a new common ground in which we come together to solve our problems.

I want our children's generation to inherit an America with as much opportunity as the one I was brought into. The best days of America should be, can be, will be before us if we work together. If people take the kind of responsibility you have taken to make our country better, we will do better. But it's going to take a good attitude. It's going to take good citizenship. It's going to take a willingness to listen to one another to find that common ground.

I have made a commitment that when I differ with the Republican Congress, I will offer an alternative. I have made a commitment that I will have more conversation and less combat, like I did with my conversation with the Speaker up in New Hampshire. I have made a commitment to try to work for the long-term interests of our country, not just for the short-term gain. These are profoundly important things. And I have made a commitment not just to berate the worst in our country but to try to extol, extol the best—people like you that are doing things that work.

What you have to do is to be active and good citizens. Tell these Members of Con-

gress that you will support cutting the deficit, you will support balancing the budget, but investing in our country and having the Federal Government play a role, which in the larger scheme of things is still a modest role but a critical one, is absolutely essential for our future.

You've been working hard out there, and a lot of you work under very difficult circumstances. But there is no more noble, no more important task, especially at this moment when we stand on the threshold of a new century.

I thank you for your service to your country. I thank you for your service to the children and to the future of America. I wish you well. I ask for your good wishes and your strength and your willingness to stand for what you know is right for America.

God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke by satellite at 2:20 p.m. from Room 459 in the Old Executive Office Building to the National Education Association (NEA) convention meeting in Minneapolis, MN. In his remarks, he referred to Keith Geiger, president, NEA.

### Telephone Conversation with Space Shuttle *Atlantis* Astronauts

July 7, 1995

**The President.** Hello? Captain Gibson?

**Commander Robert L. Gibson.** Hello, Mr. President. This is Captain Gibson. We're on-line.

**The President.** Welcome home, and congratulations. We are very proud of you.

**Commander Gibson.** [Inaudible]—Mr. President. It's a pleasure for us to be back—back on the ground again and to have had the opportunity to take part in this flight.

**The President.** Well, the pictures were wonderful, and we all watched you with absolute fascination and incredible support and enthusiasm. This is truly the beginning of a new era of cooperation in space between the United States and Russia. We've built a new relationship between our two countries. We're doing things together. And I think that what you and your team and what the Russians did together symbolizes that more than anything that I could ever say. And I think

because of your mission now, the United States and Russia, with our partners in Canada and Japan and Europe, are going to be able to meet the challenge of building the international space station. And I hope you and all of your team members will take an enormous amount of pride in that.

**Commander Gibson.** Well, thank you, Mr. President, for those extremely kind words. We certainly will. And I can tell you very honestly that at least all of us on the crew have a lot of very good friends in Russia and among the Russian Cosmonaut Corps and elsewhere in Russia. And I look forward very much to all of us continuing this.

**The President.** So do I. Before I sign off—I know you're tired and I know you're glad to be home—I want to offer a special congratulations to Norm Thagard on his record-breaking stay on orbit. We're all very proud of that. And I want to invite the entire crew to the White House as soon as you can come, because I want to hear some more about the mission, and we need to talk about where we're going from here to keep the United States commitment to space exploration, travel, and to keep our whole program strong and alive.

**Astronaut Norman E. Thagard.** Mr. President, thanks for the words. This is Norm Thagard. The Russians took good care of me. We're great friends, so I think if what we did on a personal level is any indication, there won't be any problem with us on an intergovernmental level as well. And I'm sitting here looking at my two Russian crewmates, and I couldn't be more pleased with a crew that I've ever had.

**The President.** The next time we have any problems between American and Russian officials, I'm going to send them into space. I think I now know how to solve all international problems. [Laughter]

I thank you very much, and I look forward to seeing all of you. Welcome home.

**Commander Gibson.** Thank you, Mr. President. We really appreciate your time and your support.

**The President.** Thank you. Goodbye.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:27 a.m. from the Oval Office at the White House.

## **Statement on the National Economy** *July 7, 1995*

Today's employment report shows that since the start of our administration, the economy has created 7 million jobs, with over 92 percent of them created in the private sector. When I ran for President, I stated that this country must have a strategy to strengthen and restore the American dream and that a core element of this strategy must be to create more and better jobs for hard-working Americans.

Seven million jobs in 30 months is very good news, but still not good enough: millions of families are still working harder than ever just to stay in place. In order to increase incomes for hardworking Americans, we must remain committed to a broadbased economic strategy to reward work, balance the budget, open markets for American goods, invest in education and training, target tax cuts to helping families invest in their futures, and take serious steps to health reform while protecting Medicare.

---

### **Digest of Other White House Announcements**

---

The following list includes the President's public schedule and other items of general interest announced by the Office of the Press Secretary and not included elsewhere in this issue.

---

#### **July 1**

In the afternoon, the President and Hillary Clinton traveled from Miami, FL, to New Haven, CT. They returned to Washington, DC, late in the evening.

#### **July 3**

In the afternoon, the President and Hillary Clinton traveled to Camp David, MD.

#### **July 5**

In the afternoon, the President and Hillary Clinton returned to Washington, DC.

The White House announced the President has invited President Ernesto Perez Balladares of Panama for an official working visit on September 7.

The President announced his intention to nominate John Raymond Garamendi to be Deputy Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Interior.

The President announced his intention to nominate Cheryl Halpern as a member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for the International Bureau of Broadcasting.

The President announced his intention to appoint Irving J. Stolberg to the Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad.

#### **July 6**

In the afternoon, the President attended a reception in Riggs Library at George Washington University.

The White House announced the President has accepted the invitations by the British and Irish Governments to visit the United Kingdom and Ireland, November 29 to December 2.

The White House announced the President has invited President Nicephore Soglo of Benin for an official working visit to the White House on July 13.

The President announced his intention to nominate Richard Henry Jones as Ambassador to Lebanon.

The President announced his intention to renominate Ernest W. DuBester to the National Mediation Board.

The President announced his intention to appoint Ruth Ann Minner to the Advisory Committee on the Arts of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

---

### **Nominations Submitted to the Senate**

---

NOTE: No nominations were submitted to the Senate during the period covered by this issue.

---

**Checklist  
of White House Press Releases**

---

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

---

***Released July 5***

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing the visit of President Balladares of Panama on September 7

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing the President's letter to Congressional leaders on AIDS legislation

***Released July 6***

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing the President's visit to the United Kingdom and Ireland

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing the visit of President Soglo of Benin on July 13

---

**Acts Approved  
by the President**

---

***Approved July 2***

S. 962 / Public Law 104-17  
To extend authorities under the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994 until August 15, 1995

***Approved July 7***

H.R. 483 / Public Law 104-18  
To amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 to permit medicare select policies to be offered in all States